

four years earlier, almost beating out the tomfool Republican candidate, the Wall Street economist Pierre Rinfret?

McCall and London were supposed to be neck-and-neck in the polls; so how did he wind up with a six point margin, the first black ever to be elected to a statewide office in New York?

In the first place, McCall, a former banker, raised a lot more money, and he poured out TV attacks on London's conservative views. As a black, moreover, he was able to bring out more support than the others from black neighborhoods. But, after all, it was a conservative and a white political year, and these factors were not the keys to McCall's surprising victory. The key is that Herb London blew the race, committing a series of wrong-headed and almost ludicrous miscalculations. Let's face it: Herb London goofed.

One problem is that Herb was a visible sorehead. He had tried to run for governor, and his delegates at the Republican state convention were strong-armed by D'Amato so as not only to nominate Pataki, but also to deprive London of the 25 percent he needed to get automatically on the primary ballot without having to go through the difficult process of gathering signatures. London denounced this deed as an outrage, and threatened to run against Pataki on the Conservative ticket, whereupon he was

persuaded by the D'Amato forces to take the Comptroller's spot on the ticket. But London couldn't keep his mouth shut, and twice he deeply angered the Republicans by openly attacking Pataki, the head of his own ticket, and suggested that Pataki either lead or get out of the way.

But worse than that: London, an Orthodox Jew, made as the central theme of his campaign: anti-Semitism! denouncing the Crown Heights riots and trying to implicate McCall as a black anti-Semite. This absurd charge was promptly rebutted by the McCall camp, bringing out several prominent Jews to protest this outrage. But more importantly, Herb London never seemed to realize that while Crown Heights and charges of anti-Semitism may go over big in Brooklyn, upstate WASPs and Catholics really don't spend their days worrying about Jews and anti-Semitism. It is simply not their central concern, and until he wises up to this central fact of life, Herb London will never win a statewide election.

Coda

And so justice pretty much triumphed in the New York election. After the election, George Pataki moved swiftly if quietly to punish the Backstabbing Republican Left. It took two weeks for Pataki to return Giuliani's Election Night congratulatory phone call, and it is pretty clear that goodies are not going

to flow Rudy's way in the next few years. In addition, Pataki moved effectively behind the scenes to dump the long-time Nestor of the Republican Left in New York State, State Senate majority leader Ralph Marino, whom the Senate Republicans kicked out in behalf of the conservative Joseph Bruno. In a desperate attempt to save his precious power job, Marino offered to sacrifice his widely hated long-time counsel and theoretician, Angelo Mangia, but Marino had no takers. Both Mangia and his boss are out, and Marino is now talking elegiacally of immediate retirement. 1994 was the end of a political era in New York State in more ways than one. ■

Why They Hate Jesse

by Justin Raimondo

When Senator Jesse Helms dared state the obvious—that Bill Clinton is not only "not up to the job of Commander-in-Chief," but also widely hated by our men and women in uniform—the firestorm of protest was way out of proportion to the alleged crime. The story ran for three solid days, and gave rise to a spate of Hate Jesse articles that pilloried the 73-year-old Senator from North Carolina. The media lynch mob was out for blood, and pundits of both the left and the right were unanimous in their as-

essment: Jesse is a "loose cannon" whose chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will prove a liability to the GOP.

Why do they hate Jesse so?

Culturally, of course, he makes the perfect media villain: a Southern white man who does not genuflect at the altar of Martin Luther King, and who once (correctly) characterized Roberta Achtenberg, the openly homosexual HUD enforcer, as a "mean lesbian." Just on the basis of his cultural views, he has become a valuable fundraising tool for the liberal-left

direct mail mavens, who will no doubt raise much money scaring their followers with visions of Jesse standing over the prostrate body of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Liberals just naturally loathe Senator Helms, and the feeling is mutual. But what about his alleged friends on the right? Why didn't conservative commentators, intellectuals, and any of the other vaguely rightwing talking heads rush to Jesse's defense? Typical was a representative of the Heritage Foundation, who appeared along with two lib-

erals on Larry King (three, including Larry) in a panel discussion devoted to the Senator's sins. This alleged spokesman for the Right condemned the remark about Clinton as an act of *lese majeste*,

and agreed that Jesse did indeed need to be reined in and generally "moderated" if he is to assume the chairmanship of the prestigious foreign relations committee.

Both the right and left wings of the Establishment are quaking in their boots at the prospect of having to deal with Chairman Helms. The reason is because Jesse

has conducted a one-man crusade against the internationalist foreign policy of the U.S. Department of State. He has defended our sovereignty against the machinations of UN bureaucrats and their American collaborators; he has defended American taxpayers against the extortion racket called "foreignaid"; he has defended the lives and honor of American soldiers by denouncing the U.S. occupation of Haiti as "disgraceful." A recent *New York Times* article quotes an old friend, Admiral Nance, as saying the Helms committee will "pepper the Clinton Ad-

ministration with questions like: What is the point of foreign aid? Why should the United States support the United Nations? Why should Americans go on peacekeeping missions? What are we doing in Haiti?" [*New York Times*, 12/7/94.]

These are the same questions the American people are asking. Now that the Cold War is over, what exactly is the point of a foreign policy that involves stationing troops in 75 countries, about 40 percent of all the nations in the world?

The internationalists of both parties, and their talking-head marionettes in the media, most emphatically do not want this question asked in public—especially by the Chairman of a powerful Senate committee, who has the power to call the Administration on the carpet and create a very public forum for his views.

The motive behind the media mugging of Jesse Helms was reflected in the headline over the *Times* story: "Helms: A Man Who Has His Own Foreign Policy." While always a strong anti-Communist, Helms fought single-handedly against the internationalist sell-out policies that were part of the Cold War national security state, notably the foreign aid gravy-train and the United Nations scheme to swindle us out of our sovereignty. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, Helms has become the leading noninterventionist in Congress, a lone voice in the Sen-

Why didn't conservative commentators, intellectuals, and any of the other vaguely rightwing talking heads rush to Jesse's defense?

ate raised against the madness of a policy that casts the U.S. in the role of security guard and wetnurse to the world.

The foreign policy of Jesse Helms is the policy of the Founders, who warned Americans against foreign entanglements: it is the foreign policy of the Old Right, a Right consisting of such giants as John T. Flynn, Garet Garrett, and *Chicago Tribune* media mogul Colonel Robert Rutherford McCormick, who mourned the decline of the Republic and warned of the rise of Empire. In the official conservative movement of today, consisting of such pygmies as Buckley, Podhoretz, and the Kristols (Irving and William), Jesse Helms is an outcast, an embarrassment—and an enemy, albeit one to be treated with kid gloves.

Beyond the Beltway, however, out in the *real* conservative movement, it is quite a different story: Jesse is admired and even loved for the very reasons he has been vilified by the liberal-neocon elite: his intransigence, his truculence, his candor. They love him because he intransigently opposes the striped-pants careerists who are selling America down the river; they love him for his truculent rejection of Haitian President Aristide as mentally unstable and a Commie to boot; and most of all they love him for his candor in daring to say out loud what is in their hearts.

Jesse Helms is not an em-

barrassment to be nervously explained away, but a true hero. For years, he has stood like a rock against the schemes and machinations of the One-Worlders, the foreign lobbyists, and the “internationally-minded” set that dominates the Eastern fringe of the country. For that he deserves not a rebuke but a medal. ■

Rising Expectations

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

The Republican elites will betray the electoral revolution of 1994. They have too much at stake in the current system to change it, and little to lose—they think—by making only cosmetic and symbolic changes in government’s size. On the ideological spectrum, Robert Dole and Newt Gingrich not only stand to the left of their party’s dominant wing, but also to the left of the average American voter.

The public’s political mandate has been betrayed before. In 1980, almost everyone anticipated, for starters, a repeal of the Great Society and the reestablishment of a gold standard. And welfare bums were combing the want ads. But from his first budget, it was clear that Ronald Reagan did not intend to do what he had been elected to do. He didn’t admit this, of course. Instead, he deflected attention from his own expansion of government onto Congress

and supposed foreign threats.

Thus for years, the Republican leadership and its media allies at the *Wall Street Journal* yapped that all domestic evil stemmed from the legislature. This was a tall tale. It ignored the sins of Republican presidents, and papered-over the contribution of Congress in *cutting* all but one of Reagan’s budget requests. The truth is that for twelve years, Republicans controlled and expanded every executive-branch agency, despite voter demands that they cut across the board.

Well, now the Republicans *are* the Congress, and this fact has created an explosion in expectations. The American people want radical changes, as do some Republican backbenchers. The result will be more direct lobbying for liberty than ever before.

As long as the Democrats were running Congress, the masses of limited-government idealists assumed that lobbying was largely futile. Congress heard mostly from those who wanted a subsidy. But now Congress will hear from the majority that is sick of the District of Pork. These idealists will demand the ideal, which is “government” that barely escapes being government at all.

After all, nearly every American has some gripe about a federal tax, a federal mandate, a federal agency, a federal program, or a federal police agent. That’s why Americans will demand immediate changes, not accept